



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

COMMUNICATION

Through my own carelessness I overlooked the note printed on p. 181 of the issue of the REVIEW for October, 1900, but I trust you will permit me to give some reasons for not regarding it as conclusive. While the particular items are of little importance in themselves, they illustrate what I believe to be one of the cardinal rules of good editing of original material. And first as to the name which Mr. Hamilton insists is Botomworth. In the *Official Army List*, issued by the British War Office, the name is given as Bosomworth. In the *Correspondence of Horatio Sharpe*, of Maryland, it is printed Bosomworth. In the *Bouquet Correspondence* there are five letters from Bosomworth; in two of Bouquet's own letters Bosomworth is mentioned, and in one of Loudoun's letters the name is Bosomworth. Now, Mr. Brymner and his copyists could not have had any interest in making the spelling of so unimportant a man uniform, and the references are widely separated in his *Calendar of the Bouquet Papers*. In my opinion a conscientious editor would first examine contemporary readings of the name before introducing an entirely new reading, one not to be found in any work of standing, and one that seems to rest simply upon the guess of the editor. I cannot regard the tracing as conclusive when the weight of evidence is so strong on the other side.

Then as to the spelling of the word Conococheig. The Indian names of places have been almost as badly treated as the Indians themselves, and have been often mangled beyond recognition. Yet even in such cases a general rule of treatment will be of service as indicating a common pronunciation, to which in cases of doubt the spelling may be made to conform. In the many different ways of spelling this particular word, by far the largest number point to a last syllable cheig, cheague, cheeg, or a *k* in place of the *g*, that is, the last syllable has an *e* sound. Under these circumstances an editor is, in my opinion, justified in reading this *e* sound into the most variable spellings, provided the proper number of strokes of the pen are present, or with some such basis to rest a change upon. Therefore, whenever the tracing shows two strokes of the pen, they should be read as *ee* or *ie* or *ei*, as these letters express the sound which the general consensus of forms shows. To introduce a *u* is to do violence to the text and mislead unnecessarily the reader. My complaint has been that Mr. Hamilton goes out of his way to read strange forms into the text before him, and especially proper names. The two items given are but samples of what appears to me to be his carelessness, for he has not adduced a single good reason why he read a doubtful letter into Botomworth, or refused to recognize the general acceptance of the *e* sound in the name of the place.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.